

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 06451 01 OF 04 061252Z  
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-01  
INR-07 IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01  
PM-04 PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 NSCE-00  
SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 /083 W  
-----069490 061309Z /45

O 060944Z JUL 77  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 4633  
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE  
INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA IMMEDIATE  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE BE  
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GER

S E C R E T SECTION 01 OF 04 NATO 06451

E.O.11652: GDS  
TAGS: PARM, NATO  
SUBJECT: MBFR: DATA DISAGGREGATION: SPC MEETING JULY 5

REF: (A) STATE 155104 (DTG 021555Z JUL 77),  
(B) NATO 6310 (DTG 011237Z JUL 77),  
(C) MBFR VIENNA 365 (DTG 040956Z JUL 77),  
(D) MBFR VIENNA 363 (DTG 011728Z JUL 77)

SUMMARY: AT JULY 5 SPC MEETING, FRG REP REMAINED FIRM ON  
STEP BY STEP APPROACH FOR TABLING THE DIFFERENT CATEGORIES  
OF GROUND MANPOWER DATA, WHILE NOTING THAT THE FRG WILL BE  
VERY FLEXIBLE ON THE TIME BETWEEN STEPS. OTHER SPC REPS  
POINTED OUT THAT THE WEST WOULD STILL BE RESERVING THE  
RIGHT TO INTERRUPT THE TABLING OF DATA AT ANY POINT, AND  
THAT THERE WERE NO VALID TECHNICAL REASONS WHICH COULD BE  
CITED TO THE EAST FOR PROCEEDING IN THIS MANNER. FRG STEP  
BY STEP APPROACH WAS CRITICIZED ON GROUNDS OF NEGOTIABILITY,  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 06451 01 OF 04 061252Z

AND AS UNNECESSARY. ONE NEW ARGUMENT AGAINST THE STEP BY  
STEP APPROACH WAS RAISED BY ITALIAN REP, WHO POINTED OUT  
THAT IF THE WEST MUST BE SATISFIED THAT THE DATA IN ANY  
GIVEN STEP INCLUDED ALL THE RELEVANT DATA, IT WOULD IMPLY  
TO SOME EXTENT WESTERN ACCEPTANCE OF THAT DATA IF THE WEST  
AGREED TO MOVE TO THE NEXT STEP. FRG DID NOT ATTEMPT TO  
REPLY TO THIS OR TO SEVERAL OF THE OTHER ARGUMENTS,

ALTHOUGH HE STRESSED THE IMPORTANCE OF THE STEP BY STEP APPROACH AS A VEIL AGAINST NATIONAL TOTALS. UK REP SUGGESTED ON A PERSONAL BASIS THAT ALL REFERENCE TO STEPS BE ELIMINATED FROM THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, AND THAT IT BE LEFT UP TO THE AHG WHETHER OR NOT TO HAVE SEPARATE STEPS FOR THE TABLING OF GROUND MANPOWER DATA. ACTION REQUESTED: IN TIME FOR SPC MEETING THURSDAY, JULY 7: SEE PARA 25 BELOW. END SUMMARY.

-

1. FRG REP (CITRON) SAID THE FRG MAINTAINED ITS ATTACHMENT TO A STEP BY STEP APPROACH IN TABLING GROUND MANPOWER DATA. THE FRG WILL BE VERY FLEXIBLE ON THE TIME BETWEEN STEPS. ONE STEP WOULD BE CONCLUDED ONCE ALL THE RELEVANT DATA ON THAT STEP WAS ON THE TABLE. TRANSITION TO THE NEXT STEP WOULD NOT BE SUBJECT TO A RIGID TIME TABLE, BUT WOULD BE AT THE DISCRETION OF THE AHG. THE FRG DOES NOT WISH TO BLOCK THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DATA DISCUSSION IN VIENNA WITH ENDLESS DISCUSSION AT EACH STEP. FOR EXAMPLE, THE STEP ON MAJOR UNITS WOULD BE COMPLETED WHEN FIGURES ON ALL THE ARMIES ARE ON THE TABLE. IT WAS NOT TO BE EXCLUDED THAT ALL THE STEPS COULD BE CARRIED OUT AT THE SAME MEETING.

2. US REP (MOORE) PER REF A MAINTAINED THE US POSITION ON THE STEP BY STEP APPROACH. HE NOTED THAT REGARDLESS OF GOOD INTENTIONS WITHIN THE ALLIANCE NOT TO SPEND TOO MUCH TIME ON A GIVEN STEP THE EAST WOULD SEE THAT THE WEST WAS  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 06451 01 OF 04 061252Z

RESERVING THE RIGHT TO INTERRUPT THE TABLING OF DATA AT ANY POINT. THIS WOULD ADD A SIGNIFICANT AND UNNECESSARY BURDEN TO THE NEGOTIABILITY OF THE WESTERN OFFER FOR CONTINUING THE DATA DISCUSSION. THE EAST WOULD OF COURSE HAVE THE SAME RIGHT TO STOP AT ANY OF THE STEPS IT WISHED. HE ALSO QUESTIONED HOW THE AHG WOULD EXPLAIN THE STEP BY STEP APPROACH. THE AHG COULD NOT OFFER TECHNICAL REASONS, SINCE DIVERGENCIES IN THE DATA ON MAJOR UNITS COULD NOT BE RESOLVED UNTIL ALL THE OTHER DATA WAS DOWN.

3. CANADIAN REP (BARTLEMAN) NOTED THE OPPOSITION OF HIS AUTHORITIES TO THE STEP BY STEP APPROACH. CANADA WISHES THE STEPS IN PARA 1 OF THE REVISED DRAFT GUIDANCE (PARA 11, REF A) TAKEN TOGETHER. DUTCH REP STRESSED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES BELIEVE THAT IF WE ARE TO HAVE A MEANINGFUL DATA DISCUSSION, THE WESTERN DATA ON GROUND MANPOWER HAS TO BE PUT ON THE TABLE AT THE SAME TIME. IT MUST BE CLEAR TO THE OTHER SIDE THAT THE WEST IS NOT IN A POSITION TO WITHHOLD ANY OF THE DATA. BELGIAN REP (CROLLEN) ASKED WHY, IF THE FRG WAS WILLING TO HAVE VERY SHORT PERIODS BETWEEN STEPS, THE FRG COULD NOT SIMPLY DO WITHOUT SEPARATE STEPS. THE AHG WOULD HAVE NO VALID RESPONSE TO EASTERN QUESTIONS AS

TO WHY IT IS NECESSARY TO TABLE GROUND MANPOWER DATA IN SEPARATE STEPS. THE WEST WOULD BE IN A POSITION TO DECIDE WHETHER IT WOULD PUT ALL THE DATA DOWN, AND SO WOULD THE EAST.

4. FRG REP NOTED THE EXTREME DIFFICULTY WHICH THE FRG HAS WITH ANYTHING THAT LOOKS LIKE NATIONAL TOTALS. HE STRESSED THAT THERE MUST BE A DISTINCTION BETWEEN STEP ONE B AND STEP ONE D. US REP REITERATED THAT NATIONAL TOTALS COULD NOT BE OBTAINED FROM THE FIGURES WHICH THE WEST WOULD TABLE, AND THAT IN ANY EVENT, IF THE FRG WISHES TO PUT DATA DOWN

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 06451 02 OF 04 061132Z  
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-01

INR-07 IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01

PM-04 PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 NSCE-00

SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 /083 W

-----068689 061310Z /45

O 060944Z JUL 77 ZDK

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 4634

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE BE

USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GER

S E C R E T SECTION 02 OF 04 NATO 06451

IN SEPARATE STEPS, MOST OF THE ALLIES COULD AGREE THAT GROUND MANPOWER COULD BE ONE STEP AND AIR MANPOWER COULD BE A SECOND STEP.

5. UK REP (HOLMER), ON A PERSONAL BASIS WONDERED IF THE SOLUTION MIGHT NOT BE TO REMOVE ALL REFERENCES TO "STEP BY STEP" FROM THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, AND LEAVE IT COMPLETELY TO THE AHG TO DETERMINE THE GRADATION OF THE VARIOUS ELEMENTS IN THE DRAFT GUIDANCE. CANADIAN REP, WHILE NOTING CANADA'S PREFERENCE FOR DRAFT GUIDANCE MAKING CLEAR THAT GROUND DATA SHOULD BE TABLED IN A SINGLE STEP, WONDERED IF THE UK REP'S SUGGESTION MIGHT NOT BE A GOOD WAY OUT. DUTCH REP SAID HE FELT MUCH AS DID THE CANADIAN REP. US REP

CAUTIONED AGAINST SIMPLY PASSING ON A REAL DIFFERENCE IN  
VIEWS FOR THE AHG TO SORT OUT.

6. MC REP (GROUP CAPTAIN SMITH) NOTED THAT FROM A TECHNICAL  
STANDPOINT IT WAS NECESSARY TO HAVE ALL OF THE FIGURES  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 06451 02 OF 04 061132Z

FROM THE OTHER SIDE IN A BLOCK IN ORDER TO MAKE JUDGMENTS  
ABOUT ANY OF THE FIGURES. RE AN EARLIER REMARK BY THE FRG  
REP, HE NOTED THAT IF THE EAST ACCEPTS THE FRAMEWORK PRO-  
POSED BY THE WEST, THE EAST WOULD HAVE TO PUT DOWN DATA ON  
ALL OF THE ELEMENTS IN THE FRAMEWORK. IT WAS INCONCEIVABLE  
THAT THE EAST WOULD OMIT AN ARMY, AS FRG REP HAD SUG-  
GESTED. THEY WOULD EXPOSE THEMSELVES TO AN EASY CHALLENGE  
BY THE AHG.

7. MC REP WONDERED IF ONE SOLUTION MIGHT NOT BE TO DELETE  
THE BRACKETED PHRASE "AND STEP BY STEP" IN PARA 1 OF THE  
TEXT, AND REPLACE IT BY "AND PROGRESSIVE," SO THAT THE  
SENTENCE WOULD REFER TO PRESENTING "ONLY RECIPROCAL AND  
PROGRESSIVE BASIS" ADDITIONAL DATA ON GROUND FORCE MANPOWER.  
IN ADDITION, THE VARIOUS ELEMENTS OF GROUND MANPOWER COULD  
BE PRESENTED IN SEPARATE SCHEDULES, ON SEPARATE PIECES OF  
PAPER. STEPS ONE A AND B COULD BE COMBINED, AND D COULD  
BE BROUGHT UP BEFORE C. C COULD BEGIN "AT AN APPROPRIATE  
TIME" TO MAKE CLEAR THAT THE WEST WAS NOT REQUIRING DIVI-  
SIONAL DATA AT THE OUTSET.

8. US REP SAID HE DID NOT THINK "AND PROGRESSIVE" WAS  
NECESSARY, AND IT COULD CREATE THE IMPRESSION OF CLEARLY  
DISTINCT STEPS. HOWEVER, PRESENTING THE VARIOUS ELEMENTS  
OF GROUND MANPOWER IN SEPARATE SCHEDULES, ON SEPARATE  
PIECES OF PAPER, AT THE SAME TIME, WAS CERTAINLY FEASIBLE.  
THE AHG COULD PRESENT THE DATA IN THIS MANNER WITHOUT  
REQUIRING THE EAST TO TABLE THE DATA IN A SIMILAR MANNER.  
HE SAID HE WAS ATTRACTED BY THE MC REP'S SUGGESTION OF ADD-  
ING "AT AN APPROPRIATE TIME" BEFORE ELEMENT C ON DIVISIONAL  
DATA. UK REP SAID HE WAS ATTRACTED BY MC REP'S SUGGESTION  
ABOUT SEPARATE SCHEDULES, AND HE SUPPORTED ADDING "AT AN  
APPROPRIATE TIME" TO ELEMENT C ON DIVISIONAL DATA.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 06451 02 OF 04 061132Z

9. BELGIAN REP OPPOSED ADDING "AT AN APPROPRIATE TIME"  
BEFORE ELEMENT C ON DIVISIONAL DATA. IF THE EAST DOES NOT  
WISH TO DISCUSS DIVISIONAL DATA AT THIS TIME, THE EAST CAN

SAY SO, AND THE WEST WILL HAVE MADE A TACTICAL POINT.  
CANADIAN REP SAID THAT HIS AUTHORITIES WOULD FAVOR DELETING  
ELEMENT A AS REDUNDANT, AND BRINGING TOGETHER ELEMENTS B  
AND D, WHILE INCORPORATING THE LANGUAGE OF THE UK FOOTNOTE  
INTO ELEMENT C ON DIVISIONAL DATA.  
US REP NOTED THAT HE THOUGHT THAT CANADIAN REP HAD A  
POINT ABOUT DELETION OF ELEMENT A, AND THAT HE THOUGHT  
HIS AUTHORITIES WOULD SUPPORT ITS DELETION IF THERE WERE  
A CONSENSUS TO DO SO.

10. DANISH REP (TILLISCH) SUGGESTED THAT THE DIFFERENT  
ELEMENTS OF GROUND MANPOWER DATA BE TABLED AS A SERIES  
OF DIFFERENT ACTS, NOT LABELED AS STEPS, WITHIN THE SAME  
LIMITED TIME FRAME. US AND CANADIAN REPS NOTED THE DIF-  
FICULTY IN EXPLAINING TO THE OTHER SIDE WHEY THE WEST  
WOULD WISH TO PROCEED IN THIS MANNER. FRG REP NOTED  
THAT THE FRG WOULD STILL NEED SOME WORDING IN ELEMENT D  
TO EXPLAIN THAT THE WEST WOULD TAKE THIS STEP ONLY AFTER  
ASCERTAINING THAT THE DATA ON MAJOR UNITS WAS COMPLETE.

11. ITALIAN REP (CIARRAPICO) CITED AN ARGUMENT AGAINST  
THE STEP BY STEP APPROACH WHICH HAD NOT HITHERTO BEEN USED.  
IF THE WEST MUST BE SATISFIED TO ANY EXTENT AT ALL THAT THE  
DATA IN ANY GIVEN STEP INCLUDED ALL THE RELEVANT DATA, IT  
WOULD IMPLY TO SOME EXTENT WESTERN ACCEPTANCE OF THAT DATA  
IF THE WEST AGREED TO MOVE TO THE NEXT STEP.

-  
-

12. THE FOLLOWING PARAS DESCRIBE DISCUSSION OF VARIOUS  
POINTS OF LANGUAGE IN THE DRAFT TEXT (IN PARA 11, REF A).

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 06451 03 OF 04 061141Z  
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-01  
INR-07 IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01  
PM-04 PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 NSCE-00  
SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 /083 W

-----068755 061310Z /45

O 060944Z JUL 77 ZDK  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 4635  
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE  
INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE BE  
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GER

S E C R E T SECTION 03 OF 04 NATO 06451

13. RE THE HEADING TO PARA 1 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, THE BRACKETED LANGUAGE SUPPORTED BY THE MAJORITY ALREADY MAKES CLEAR THAT EXCHANGE OF GROUND DATA WOULD BE A FIRST STEP AND EXCHANGE OF AIR DATA WOULD BE A SECOND STEP. THUS WE BELIEVE THE GOAL OF PARA 2, REF C, IS ALREADY MET BY THE EXISTING LANGUAGE. HOWEVER, TO UNDERLINE THE US VIEW ON THE STEP BY STEP APPROACH, WE SUGGESTED IN SPC THAT AFTER THE WORDS "IN PARTICULAR" BE ADDED "PRESENT THE FOLLOWING DATA ON GROUND FORCE MANPOWER TOGETHER."

14. RE PARA 1A OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, FRG REP SAID FRG COULD ACCEPT THE UK FOOTNOTE NUMBER 1, THAT WESTERN NEGOTIATORS SHOULD NOT INSIST THAT THE EAST TABLE DATA ON EASTERN DIVISIONS OUTSIDE ARMIES WITH THAT OF MAJOR FORMATIONS, IF THE FOLLOWING PHRASE WERE ADDED TO THE FINAL SENTENCE OF THE FOOTNOTE: "BUT SHOULD SUGGEST THAT THESE DIVISIONS BE INCLUDED IN STEP D." FRG COULD THEN DROP THE  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 06451 03 OF 04 061141Z

BRACKETS AROUND "AND IN DIVISIONS OUTSIDE THESE MAJOR FORMATIONS." FRG REP LATER TOLD US PRIVATELY HE THOUGHT BONN COULD ACCEPT CONCLUDING THE PHRASE BY "IN STEP C OR D." HE ALSO THOUGHT BONN MIGHT BE ABLE TO DELETE THE PHRASE IN BRACKETS IN PARA 1A ("AND IN DIVISIONS OUTSIDE THESE MAJOR FORMATIONS"). ACTION REQUESTED: WASHINGTON GUIDANCE ON THIS POINT.

15. RE PARA 1C ON DIVISIONAL DATA OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, IT SEEMS TO US THAT A GOOD COMPROMISE BETWEEN THE PRESENT TEXT AND THE SUGGESTION OF MC REP ("AT AN APPROPRIATE TIME") WOULD BE THE APPROACH SUGGESTED IN PARA 4, REF C. ACTION REQUESTED: WASHINGTON GUIDANCE ON THIS POINT.

16. RE PARA 1D ON "OTHER PERSONNEL" OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, WE SUGGESTED THAT THE FIRST TIC BE DELETED IN FAVOR OF THE LANGUAGE IN PARA 5, REF C, IN THE INTEREST OF CLARITY.

17. RE PARA 2 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, ON AIR MANPOWER, UK REP STATED THAT THE UK WANTS TO KEEP THE WORD "IMMEDIATELY."

18. IN THE FIRST PART OF PARA 3 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, UK REP SAID THE UK WANTS TO KEEP THE PHRASE "EXCEPT ON AN

ILLUSTRATIVE BASIS." THE ULTIMATE PURPOSE OF THE EXERCISE IS TO SEEK AGREEMENT ON DATA WHICH WOULD SERVE AS THE BASIS FOR REDUCTIONS AND LIMITATIONS. US REP POINTED OUT THAT AGGREGATE DATA COULD BE USED TO DISCUSS FUTURE REDUCTIONS AND LIMITATIONS ON AN ILLUSTRATIVE BASIS. HOWEVER, THIS TIC CLEARLY REFERS TO THE "DETAILED FIGURES" TO BE TABLED IN THE PRESENT EXERCISE. IT WOULD THUS SEEM CONFUSING IN THIS CASE TO SAY THAT THIS DATA CANNOT BE USED TO COMPUTE REDUCTIONS AND LIMITATIONS "EXCEPT ON AN ILLUSTRATIVE BASIS". (COMMENT: UK REP TOLD US PRI-  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 06451 03 OF 04 061141Z

VATELY THAT HE TOOK THE POINT. THE DETAILED DATA COULD BE USED TO DISCUSS REDUCTION OF A SOVIET TANK ARMY, ON AN ILLUSTRATIVE BASIS,BUT IT MIGHT NOT BE WORTHWHILE TO KEEP THE PHRASE FOR THIS ONE POINT. HE WOULD REPORT.  
END COMMENT)

19. RE THE BRACKETED PORTION OF PARA 3 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, ON NATIONAL REDUCTION COMMITMENTS, ITALIAN REP SUGGESTED THE SPC DEFER EXAMINATION OF THIS LANGUAGE. HE REMINDED SPC THAT THE US HADSTRATIVE BASIS". (COMMENT: UK REP TOLD US PRI-

VATELY THAT HE TOOK THE POINT. THE DETAILED DATA COULD BE USED TO DISCUSS REDUCTION OF A SOVIET TANK ARMY, ON AN ILLUSTRATIVE BASIS,BUT IT MIGHT NOT BE WORTHWHILE TO KEEP THE PHRASE FOR THIS ONE POINT. HE WOULD REPORT.  
END COMMENT)

19. RE THE BRACKETED PORTION OF PARA 3 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, ON NATIONAL REDUCTION COMMITMENTS, ITALIAN REP SUGGESTED THE SPC DEFER EXAMINATION OF THIS LANGUAGE. HE REMINDED SPC THAT THE US HADTIO  
THAT THIS SECTION OF THE DISCLAIMER SIMPLY REFERENCE THE EXISTING INTERNAL NAC GUIDANCE AND AUTHORIZE THE AHG TO DRAW ON IT IF NECESSARY. END COMMENT)  
ACTION REQUESTED: WASHINGTON COMMENT.

20. NEXT SPC MEETING ON MBFR WILL BE THURSDAY, JULY 7.

-

21. COMMENT: WE SEE THREE POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES REGARDING THE STEP BY STEP APPROACH.

22. ONE ALTERNATIVE WOULD BE FOR THE US TO WORK TOWARD GUIDANCE AIMED AT MAKING CLEAR TO THE OTHER SIDE THAT ALL THE STEPS RE GROUND MANPOWER WOULD BE UNDERTAKEN WITHIN A SHORT TIME SPAN. WE WOULD JUDGE THAT SUCH AN APPROACH WOULD MAKE THE OVERALL APPROACH MORE COMPLEX AND LESS NEGOTIABLE THAN IT ALREADY IS. THE CENTRAL DIFFICULTY IS THAT THE WEST COULD NOT CITE TO THE EAST THE REAL REASON FOR THE

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 06451 04 OF 04 061147Z  
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-01  
INR-07 IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01  
PM-04 PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 NSCE-00  
SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 /083 W  
-----068827 061311Z /45

O 060944Z JUL 77 ZDK  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 4636  
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE  
INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA IMMEDIATE  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE BE  
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GER

S E C R E T SECTION 04 OF 04 NATO 06451

STEP BY STEP APPROACH, I.E., THAT IT IS ANOTHER VEIL ON THE NATIONAL TOTAL ISSUE. THERE ARE NO TECHNICAL REASONS FOR A STEP BY STEP APPROACH, AND THE WEST WOULD HAVE TO TREAD VERY CAREFULLY TO AVOID GIVING THE EAST THE IMPRESSION THAT WE THOUGHT THEY MIGHT SIMPLY LEAVE OUT ONE OR MORE ARMIES. THE WEST WOULD HAVE TO CONVEY TO THE EAST THAT: A) ON THE ONE HAND, THE WEST WOULD WISH TO ASSURE ITSELF THAT ALL RELEVANT DATA ON A GIVEN STEP, E.G., MAJOR UNITS, HAD BEEN TABLED BEFORE PROCEEDING TO THE NEXT STEP; AND B) ON THE OTHER HAND, ALL THE STEPS WOULD BE UNDERTAKEN WITHIN A SHORT TIME SPAN. THE EAST WOULD CERTAINLY SEE THAT, GIVEN A, THERE IS NO ASSURANCE OF B. THE GUIDANCE WOULD ALSO HAVE TO MINIMIZE THE ABILITY OF THE EAST TO BREAK OFF THE DISCUSSION. FINALLY, THE STEP BY STEP APPROACH MIGHT NEED A SPECIAL DISCLAIMER OF ITS OWN, TO COVER THE POINT RAISED BY ITALIAN REP, I.E., THAT IF THE WEST MUST BE SATISFIED THAT THE DATA IN A GIVEN STEP INCLUDED ALL THE RELEVANT DATA, IT WOULD TO SOME EXTENT IMPLY WESTERN ACCEPTANCE OF THIS DATA  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 06451 04 OF 04 061147Z

IF THE WEST AGREED TO MOVE TO THE NEXT STEP.

23. A SECOND ALTERNATIVE WOULD BE FOR THE US TO STAND FIRM



IN ITS POSITION ON THE STEP BY STEP APPROACH. THIS WOULD BE OUR PREFERENCE. WE BELIEVE THIS COURSE WOULD HAVE THE SUPPORT OF MOST OF THE ALLIES. THE FRG REP HAS NOT ATTEMPTED TO REPLY TO ALL OF THE REASONS CITED AGAINST THE STEP BY STEP APPROACH, AND THE FRG PURPOSE AT THIS MEETING MIGHT HAVE BEEN A FURTHER TESTING OF THE WATER PRIOR TO A DECISION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT IT WAS NECESSARY TO GO BACK TO GENSCHER TO MODIFY THE STEP BY STEP APPROACH. IN ADDITION, THERE IS A FEELING AMONG THE OTHER ALLIES THAT THEY HAVE BEEN ACCOMMODATING TO THE FRG, AND THAT IF THE OTHER ALLIES ACCEPT NOT PUTTING DOWN NATIONAL TOTALS, EXCHANGING DATA ON AIR MANPOWER AS A SECOND STEP, AND RELEASING TO THE AHG THE INTERNAL NAC POSITION ON NATIONAL REDUCTION COMMITMENTS, THEN THE FRG SHOULD BE FLEXIBLE ON THE STEP BY STEP APPROACH. WE BELIEVE THAT STANDING FIRM RE THE STEP BY STEP APPROACH WOULD IMPLY CONVEYING TO SPC THE GIST OF PARA 7, REF D, THAT IT IS MORE IMPORTANT TO MAKE THE PROPOSAL AS NEGOTIABLE AS POSSIBLE THAN TO DECIDE ON GUIDANCE RAPIDLY IN THE SPC.

24. THE FINAL ALTERNATIVE IS THE UK REP'S PERSONAL SUGGESTION OF REMOVING ALL REFERENCE TO STEPS FROM THE GUIDANCE, AND OF GIVING THE AHG COMPLETE FLEXIBILITY ON WHETHER OR NOT TO HAVE SEPARATE STEPS FOR GROUND MANPOWER DATA. UK REP LATER INFORMED US THAT ALTHOUGH THIS IS A PERSONAL SUGGESTION, HE DID NOT MAKE IT LIGHTLY. HE OBSERVED THAT THE STEP BY STEP APPROACH IS SUCH A NON-STARTER FROM A NEGOTIATING STANDPOINT THAT BEHREND'S WOULD BE SUBJECT TO VERY GREAT PRESSURE FROM THE NEGOTIATING STANDPOINT WITHIN THE AHG. WE THINK THIS OBSERVATION IS ACCURATE, AND FOR THAT REASON WE WOULD EXPECT FRG TO OPPOSE THIS IDEA. THE UK  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 06451 04 OF 04 061147Z

REP'S SUGGESTION WOULD IN EFFECT SHIFT THE LACK OF AGREEMENT TO THE AHG.

25. ACTION REQUESTED: IN TIME FOR SPC MEETING THURSDAY, JULY 7: A) WASHINGTON COMMENT ON THE CURRENT FRG STEP BY STEP APPROACH IN LIGHT OF THE THREE ALTERNATIVES SUGGESTED IN THE COMMENT JUST ABOVE; B) WASHINGTON COMMENT ON THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, AND IN PARTICULAR AS REQUESTED IN PARAS 14, 15 AND 19 ABOVE. BENNETT

SECRET

NNN



## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01-Jan-1994 12:00:00 am  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Sent Date:** 06-Jul-1977 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Date:** 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 22 May 2009  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1977NATO06451  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** RR  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1977/newtext/t19770785/aaaacwap.tel  
**Line Count:** 485  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Message ID:** dc5f3570-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 9  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** 77 STATE 155104 (DTG 021555Z JUL 77, 77 NATO 6310 (DTG 011237Z JUL 77), 77 MBFR VIENNA 365 (DTG 040956Z JUL, 77 MBFR VIENNA 363 (DTG 011728Z JUL  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 28-Oct-2004 12:00:00 am  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 1945062  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: DATA DISAGGREGATION: SPC MEETING JULY 5  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** SECSTATE WASHDC WASHDC MULTIPLE  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvkey:** odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/dc5f3570-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
22 May 2009  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009